

REMARKS

Claims 3, 4 and 8-17 are pending in the application, of which Claim 3, 8 and 13 are independent. All claims have been rejected. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 3, 4 and 8-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dent (US 5,894,473). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The present application is directed to coordinating the servicing of high power transmission units located near a cell boundary that are likely to cause interference with units operating in an adjacent cell. Such coordination of time slots for high interference transmission in adjacent cells may be accomplished by exchanging data between adjacent base stations concerning the present operating power levels and schedules for when the high interference time slots may be allocated based on the expected high and low interference transmission times.

Dent is similarly concerned with transmitting cellular signals during allocated time slots. However, the base stations of Dent do not communicate with each other to exchange data about expected transmission levels. Instead, information about the transmission levels is received by either (1) analyzing the transmissions themselves or (2) attempting to guess what they will be like using a model (col. 8, ll. 29-37).

Dent does not teach or suggest receiving, by the operating base station, a report of an expected time of low interference communications from an adjacent base station. This feature is recited plainly in all of Applicant's independent claims (Claims 3, 8 and 13). The Applicants therefore respectfully disagree with the Examiner's conclusion of various sections of Dent as supposedly teaching this transmission of the report. In none of those places, nor anywhere else, does Dent mention or suggest the base stations sending such a report. Dent discusses only methods of either determining current transmissions levels or using a model to predict future transmission levels. The base stations of Dent do not exchange any statistics about the expected low or high interference transmission periods. Moreover, Dent specifically teaches away from transmitting a report of high and low transmission times from one station to another, by teaching that "the signal strength of the signals making up the composite signal [of the adjacent station]

can be detected by a signal strength processor, or can be predicted based upon historical models of signal strength" (col. 8, ll. 29-34). Receiving a report of expected low transmission periods is patently different from detecting or predicting them, as in Dent.

Furthermore, the Examiner himself has previously stated that the applied references, which include Dent, "fail to disclose or render obvious where the operating base station receives a report of an expected time of high and low interference transmissions from an adjacent base station" (paper no. 6, p. 4, ll. 4-7). Therefore, independent Claims 3, 8 and 13 are not anticipated by Dent and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 9-12 and 14-17 depend on Claims 3, 8 or 13, respectively, and add additional features and, therefore, are not anticipated by Dent for at least the same reasons as above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Lubashev

Lyudmila Lubashev
Registration No. 55,408
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 6/24/04